

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/789,215	02/27/2004	Linlin Xing	FDN-2829	9090
75	90 08/16/2006		EXAM	INER
William J. Davis, Esq.			COLE, ELIZABETH M	
GAF MATERIA	ALS CORPORATION			
Legal Department, Building No. 10			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1361 Alps Road Wayne, NJ 07470			1771	
			DATE MAILED: 08/16/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/789,215	XING ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
_		Elizabeth M. Cole	1771				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any i	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEMENTED IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statusely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mety filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. & 133)				
Status	,						
1)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	·						
٠,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims		00 0.0. 210.				
· <u> </u>							
	✓ Claim(s) 1-15 and 21-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s)						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
·	5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) 1-15, 21-22 is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
<i>ا</i> ان	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* S	see the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachmen	· ·	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-946) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/789,215

Art Unit: 1771

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. The previous action made a new grounds of rejection which was not in response to amendment since the limitations were already present in claim 6, so the action should not have been made final.

Page 2

- 2. Claims 1-15, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not provide support for the limitation that the polyurethane modifier is "water-based". Also, the specification does not provide support for "carboxylated polyurethane".
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-15, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heine, U.S. Patent No. 6,146,705 in view of Hawkins et al, U.S. Patent No. 3,525,779. Heine discloses a fibrous glass mat comprising fibers having a length of 1-1.5 inches and a diameter of 14-18 microns, (see col. 2, lines 35-44) which are bonded with a formaldehyde type binder. The binder is present in an amount of 5-15% by weight. The

Art Unit: 1771

mat can be used as a shingle and can have asphalt applied to it after formation. See col. 4, lines 1-27. Heine differs from the claimed invention because it does not disclose adding a minor amount of a urethane modifier to the binder. Hawkins teaches adding a minor amount of a polyurethane modifier to binder such as novolac resins which are a type of formaldehyde resin. See col. 3, lines21-26. The polyurethane modifier is present in the resin in the amount of 5-40 parts urethane per 100 parts of resin. See claims. Therefore the ratio of binder resin to modifier taught by Hawkins is as much as 20:1 which is within the claimed range. Hawkins teaches that the addition of the urethane modifier promotes the adhesion of the resin with various other components. See col. 3, lines 22-23. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added a minor amount of urethane modifier to the binder of Heine as taught by Hawkins, motivated by the expectation that this would enhance the bonding of the resin with various other components and substrates. With regard to the limitation the polyurethane modifier is "water-based", Hawkins teaches that the polyurethane can be added to the epoxy as a latex, see col. 5, lines 33-39. Additionally, it is noted that the term "water-based" is not used in the instant specification, but that those portions of the specification cited by Applicant to provide support for the limitation describe adding the polyurethane to the aqueous mixture of the binder and glass mat. Since Heine teaches the aqueous mixture, the polyurethane of Hawkins would be water-based once it was added to the Heine composition.

Application/Control Number: 10/789,215

Art Unit: 1771

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/31/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the systems of Heine and Hawkins are not compatible since the material of Hawkins is solvent based while that of Heine is water based. However, Hawkins teaches that the modifier can be added to the epoxy resin in the form of a latex, which is a dispersion of the polyurethane in water. Therefore the polyurethane resin of Hawkins is water-based.

Page 4

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth M. Cole whose telephone number is (571) 272-1475. The examiner may be reached between 6:30 AM and 6:00 PM Monday through Wednesday, and 6:30 AM and 2 PM on Thursday.

Mr. Terrel Morris, the examiner's supervisor, may be reached at (571) 272-1478.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 1771

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The fax number for all official faxes is (571) 273-8300.

Elizabeth M. Cole Primary Examiner Page 5

Art Unit 1771

e.m.c